



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 17

**LEONTARIDIS ATHANASIOS  
DIPILING V MANTZIKAS  
68 SOLONOS STREET  
ATHENS 106 8-0 GR GREECE**

**COPY MAILED**

**FEB 15 2008**

In re Application of	:	
Leontaridis Athanasios	:	
Application No. 10/018,998	:	ON PETITION
Filed: December 26, 2001	:	
Attorney Docket No. 214	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed December 3, 2007, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely respond to the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due and the Notice of Allowability, mailed November 19, 2003. On June 11, 2007 a petition under 1.137(b) was filed. The petition was dismissed in a decision mailed October 31, 2007. In response on December 3, 2007 the present petition was filed.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(d). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Director may require additional information. *See* MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(C) and (D). The instant petition lacks item (3).

35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) authorizes the Director to accept a petition "for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent." As amended December 1, 1997, 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) provides that a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by a statement that the delay was unintentional, but provides that "[t]he Commissioner may require additional

information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional." Where, as here, there is a question whether the initial delay was unintentional, the petitioner must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unintentional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b). *See In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989); 37 CFR 1.137(b). Here, in view of the inordinate delay (almost 3 ½ years) in resuming prosecution, there is a question whether the entire delay was unintentional.

Accordingly, any renewed petition must clearly identify the party having the right to reply to avoid abandonment on February 20, 2004. That party, in turn must explain what effort(s) was made to further reply to the outstanding Office action and, further, why no reply was filed. If no effort was made to further reply, then that party must explain why the delay in this application does not result from a deliberate course of action (or inaction). Likewise, as Mr. Athanasios was responsible for the application at the time of abandonment, he should explain why this application became abandoned while it was under his control and what efforts were made to reply and with whom this matter was discussed outside of all parties involved. Applicant also states that there was a foreign representative associated with this application. Copies of any correspondence relating to the filing, or not filing a further reply to the outstanding Office action are required from responsible person(s), Mr. Athanasios and whoever else was involved with this application at the time of abandonment. Statements are required from any and all persons responsible and having firsthand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the lack of a reply to the outstanding Office action. As the courts have made clear, it is pointless for the USPTO to revive a long abandoned application without an adequate showing that the delay did not result from a deliberate course of action. *See Lawman Armor v. Simon*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10843, 74 USPQ2d 1633 (DC EMich 2005); *Field Hybrids, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1159 (D. Minn Jan. 27, 2005); *Lumenyte Int'l Corp. v. Cable Lite Corp.*, Nos. 96-1011, 96-1077, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 16400, 1996 WL 383927 (Fed. Cir. July 9, 1996) (unpublished) (patents held unenforceable due to a finding of inequitable conduct in submitting an inappropriate statement that the abandonment was unintentional).

The language of both 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b) are clear and unambiguous, and, furthermore, without qualification. That is, the delay in filing the reply during prosecution, as well as in filing the petition seeking revival, must have been, without qualification, "unintentional" for the reply to now be accepted on petition. The Office requires that the entire delay be at least unintentional as a prerequisite to revival of an abandoned application to prevent abuse and injury to the public. *See H.R. Rep. No. 542*, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 771 ("[i]n order to prevent abuse and injury to the public the Commissioner . . . could require applicants to act promptly after becoming aware of the abandonment"). As noted previously, the December 1997 change to 37 CFR 1.137 did not create any new right to overcome an intentional delay in seeking revival, or in renewing an attempt at seeking revival, of an abandoned application. *See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure*; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53160 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 87 (October 21, 1997). Statements are required from any and all persons having firsthand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the protracted delay, after the abandonment date, in seeking revival. Petitioner asserts that an agent made several attempts to determine the status of the application. However, a review of the records shows that a Power to inspect and make copies was filed on

December 28, 2005. Therefore, petitioner must explain what actions were taken from December 28, 2005 up until the date the petition was filed on June 11, 2007. Petitioner must provide specific dates as to when any and all attempts were made to contact the Office about the status of the application.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he/she is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he/she acts. However, if petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to petitioner. Nevertheless, all future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the address of record until otherwise instructed.

The application file does not indicate a change of address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If appropriate, a change of address should be filed in this case in accordance with MPEP 601.03.

The petition has been reconsidered, but the results are the same.

Any further request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

Any renewed petition may be addressed as follows:

By Mail:                      Mail Stop PETITION  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    P. O. Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                      U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                                    Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

The centralized facsimile number is **(571) 273-8300**.

Correspondence regarding this decision may also be filed through the electronic filing system of the USPTO.

To expedite consideration, petitioner may wish to contact the undersigned regarding the filing of the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-1642.



April M. Wise  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

cc: ATHANASIOS LEONTARIDIS  
BOSPOROU 61  
ATHENS, 171 24 NEA SMIMI, GREECE

cc: WENDY M. SLADE  
DOWELL & DOWELL, PC  
2111 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
SUITE 406  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314